

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

d/

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,982	11/26/2003	Francois Binette	022956-0237	7987
21125 7590 05/16/2007 NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP		EXAMINER		
WORLD TRADE CENTER WEST			SINGH, SATYENDRA K	
155 SEAPORT BOULEVARD BOSTON, MA 02210-2604			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•	•		1657	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/723,982	BINETTE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Satyendra K. Singh	1657	

·	Satyendra K. Singh	1657							
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress						
THE REPLY FILED 03 May 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.									
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	ice, which FR 41.31; or (3)						
a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $\underline{4}$ months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.								
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as						
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since						
	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	ecause						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);									
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for									
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rei	aatad alaima							
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rep	ected claims.							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.112	21 See attached Notice of Non Co	maliant Amandment	(DTOL 224)						
<ul><li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li></ul>		inpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).						
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		timely filed amendme	nt canceling the						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	will not be entered, or b)      will will will will will will will	ll be entered and an e	explanation of						
Claim(s) allowed: none.	•		•						
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .		•							
Claim(s) rejected: 1,3-7 and 9-21.		•							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE									
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered s necessary and						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a						
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER									
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:						
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)								
		,							

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): obviousness rejection under 35 USC 103(a) over the relied prior art references .

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's amendments to the peding claims have been entered which overcome the obviousness rejection of record. However, in the absence of a terminal disclaimer, as mentioned in the previous advisory action (dated 4/18/2007), instant claims remain rejected under obviousness-type double patenting (over copending applications 10/374,772 and 10/374,745, in which the claims are directed to a similar or obvious variation of the claimed tissue repair implant).

SANDRA E. SAUCIER PRIMARY EXAMINER